

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended. Support for the changes to claims 1 and 3 appears in the original disclosure, including page 12, lines 17-19. Claim 6 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 1-5, 7 and 11-13 remain in the application. Claims 11-13 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. A Petition for Extension of Time is being filed concurrently herewith.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to obviate the rejection of claim 5. The claims as amended are believed to be in full compliance with § 112.

Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Labeledz in view of Watson. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 refers to “combinations of . . . companies.” The companies that make up the respective combinations have the “same . . . service characteristics,” and form “maintenance plans.” These are important aspects of the claimed invention. Please refer, for example, to Applicants’ specification, page 10, line 26 – page 12, line 4, and Fig. 2, where three different combinations of companies form three different maintenance plans, and where a maintenance plan made up of a combination of four companies A2, B1, C2, D1 is selected. The four companies have the same service characteristics, in this example, low cost.

Labeledz fails to disclose or suggest the method of claim 1, where a “facility manager terminal extracts maintenance service characteristics of . . . maintenance companies, such as cost, term of work, quality and service” and “decides combinations of maintenance companies having same said service characteristics of all . . . maintenance subjects as maintenance plans.” There is nothing in the Office Action (including the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action) to the contrary.

The Office Action relies on Watson for a different feature – selection by an owner terminal. Watson, like Labedz, fails to disclose or suggest the steps of “extract[ing] maintenance service characteristics of each of said maintenance companies” and “decid[ing] combinations of maintenance companies having same said service characteristics of all said maintenance subjects as maintenance plans.” Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over Labedz and Watson, even when the references are considered in combination.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and/or recite limitations similar to those discussed above. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 7 should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Favorable action on the application, as amended, is solicited.

Dated: July 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No. 33,082  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1825 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-5403  
(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants